

## REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his attention to this matter. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination of the application.

### Claims Objections

Claim 20 has been amended to change the word “divider” into the word “divided.”

Applicant appreciates the Examiner pointing out this typographical error.

### Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17, 19, and 20 as being anticipated by Swett. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Swett anticipates her invention and requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection on this ground.

Swett discloses and claims a container having irregular or non-circular, non-rectangular shapes (Col. 1, Ln. 58-62) and a closure cover (Col. 2, Ln. 22-24). The cover is made of a flexible material (Col. 2, Ln. 23-24) and the box portion of a stiffer but flexible material (Col. 2, Ln. 24). While Swett does teach a compartmentalized box with corresponding cover, the disclosure focuses on the ability of the flexible cover to self-align and fit the box (Col. Generally, esp. Ln. 55- 58).

With respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Swett teaches a cover affixed to the back wall and submits that Swett actually teaches away from this feature in that in Swett the cover and box are made of different materials, and, moreover, Swett does not directly discuss such a feature.

With respect to Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Swett teaches or discloses a rigid material. In fact, Swett specifically teaches the opposite in that, as

described above, the cover is made of a flexible material (Col. 2, Ln. 23-24) and the box portion of a stiffer but flexible material (Col. 2, Ln. 24).

With respect to claims 5, 10, 15, and 19, Applicant has cancelled these claims without prejudice.

With respect to claims 6 and 20, Applicant has amended the claims to include the element that the lid is attached to the container base.

With respect to claim 11, while Swett does teach compartmentalization, it does not teach an affixed lid as does Applicant's invention and as claimed in claim 11.

With respect to claim 16, Applicant has amended the claim to include the element that the lid is attached to the container base.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Swett's neither discloses nor anticipates Applicant's invention comprising a container made of rigid material and having an attached lid. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the Examiner reconsider his rejection and finds that Swett does not anticipate the Applicant's invention.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 8, and 13 as unpatentable over Swett in view of DeLaforcade for the reason that Swett essentially discloses the invention but does not teach a latch, which is taught by DeLaforcade. As argued above, Applicant respectfully disagrees that her invention is taught by Swett. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the use of a latch as disclosed by her is not obvious as disclosed by DeLaforcade. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the Examiner withdraw his 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 14, and 18 as unpatentable over Swett in view of Barabino for the reason that Swett essentially discloses the invention but does not teach a

prepackaged wipe, which is taught by Barabino. As argued above, Applicant respectfully disagrees that her invention is taught by Swett. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the use of a prepackaged towelette as claimed by her is not obvious as disclosed by Barabino. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the Examiner withdraw his 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

Applicant submits that the claims, as now presented are in allowable form and request that the Examiner recommend allowance. If the examiner believes that a discussion would help in the prosecution of this application, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert L. Knechtel (reg. No. 36,845)  
Attorney for Applicant  
Law Offices of Mark E. Wiemelt, P.C.  
10 South LaSalle Street  
Suite 3300  
Chicago, IL 60603

Telephone: 312-372-7664  
Facsimile: 312-372-6568  
Email: rknechtel@wiemeltlaw.com